

Quantum horizons and black hole entropy: Inclusion of distortion and rotation

Abhay Ashtekar,^{*} Jonathan Engle,[†] and Chris Van Den Broeck[‡]

*Institute for Gravitational Physics and Geometry,
Physics Department, Penn State, University Park, PA 16802, USA*

Abstract

Equilibrium states of black holes can be modelled by isolated horizons. If the intrinsic geometry is spherical, they are called type I while if it is axi-symmetric, they are called type II. The detailed theory of geometry of *quantum* type I horizons and the calculation of their entropy can be generalized to type II, thereby including arbitrary distortions and rotations. The leading term in entropy of large horizons is again given by 1/4th of the horizon area for the *same* value of the Barbero-Immirzi parameter as in the type I case. Ideas and constructions underlying this extension are summarized.

PACS numbers: 04.60Pp, 04.60.Ds, 04.60.Nc, 03.65.Sq

^{*}Electronic address: ashtekar@gravity.psu.edu

[†]Electronic address: engle@gravity.psu.edu

[‡]Electronic address: vdbroeck@gravity.psu.edu

Basic ideas: Isolated horizons (IHs) provide a quasi-local framework to describe black holes which are themselves in equilibrium but in space-times whose exterior regions may carry time-dependent fields and geometry [1]. The zeroth and the first laws of black hole mechanics of classical general relativity were first established for globally stationary black holes [2]. However, they extend to all IHs [3, 4]. The thermodynamic entropy is again given by $1/4$ th the horizon area (provided matter is minimally coupled to gravity). These results hold not just for the Kerr-Newman family but also for astrophysically realistic black holes which may be distorted. It is natural to ask if a quantum gravity description of the IH geometry can lead to a statistical mechanical calculation of entropy of this diverse family of black holes.

In the globally stationary situation, black holes without external influences are completely characterized by their mass (or horizon area¹), spin and possible charges associated with gauge fields and dilatons which, however, will be ignored in most of this brief presentation. The entropy of a black hole with *fixed* mass and spin is given by $1/4$ the horizon area. In the quasi-local context of IHs, mass and spin do not suffice to characterize a time independent horizon geometry. One needs an infinite set of multipoles [5] to capture the distortions in the mass and angular momentum distribution on the horizon induced, e.g., by external matter rings, which are ignored by fiat in the black hole uniqueness theorems.

We will begin by briefly recalling the notion of IHs and their multipoles. Then, we will sketch the essential features of a Hamiltonian framework for the sector of general relativity consisting of space-times which admit an isolated horizon with fixed multipoles, carry out a non-perturbative quantization using ideas from quantum geometry [6, 7, 8] and finally calculate the number of microstates of the resulting quantum horizon. This strategy is the same as that used in [9, 10, 11, 12, 13] for the simplest (type I) isolated horizons whose *intrinsic* geometry is spherical.

Isolated horizons: The precise notion of an isolated horizon (IH) is arrived at by extracting from the definition of a Killing horizon the minimum conditions necessary for black hole thermodynamics. More precisely, one begins with a null, 3-dimensional sub-manifold Δ , topologically $S^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ and with null normal ℓ , of a 4-dimensional space-time $(\mathcal{M}, g)$. Its *intrinsic* geometry is coded in a pair (q, V) consisting of a ‘metric’ q of signature $0, +, +$ and a complex-valued $U(1)$ connection V on the spin-bundle of any of its 2-sphere cross-sections S . Δ is said to be *isolated* if its intrinsic geometry is ‘time-independent’, i.e., satisfies $\mathcal{L}_\ell q = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\ell V = 0$. Since these conditions are all local to Δ , the notion of an IH is free of the global and teleological peculiarities of event horizons.

Symmetries of an IH are diffeomorphisms of Δ which preserve its geometry. By the very definition of an IH, the null normal ℓ is a symmetry. The question is whether there are others. A complete classification of the symmetry groups is available [4]. If an IH admits 3 rotational symmetries —so that q is the metric of a round sphere— it is said to be of type I. If it admits an axial symmetry, it is said to be of type II. Note that these symmetries refer to the IH itself; they need not extend to space-time. Physically, type II IHs are the most interesting ones.

Multipoles [5]: Because the notion of an IH is quasi-local, Kerr event horizons constitute

¹ In the classical isolated horizon framework, area, angular momentum and charges turn out to be primary; mass is a *derived* quantity, defined in terms of them [3, 4].

only a small sub-class of type II IHs. More general IH geometries may be distorted. A diffeomorphism invariant characterization of the geometry is provided by a set of mass and angular momentum multipole moments M_n, J_n . The physical dimension of these quantities depends on n . But they are completely determined by simpler, dimensionless ‘geometric multipoles’ I_n, L_n and the horizon area a . In the Kerr family, I_n, L_n are functions only of two parameters a, J , while in general they are arbitrary, subject only to some mild regularity conditions [5]. Here, we will emphasize the ideas and structures that are important to quantum theory.

For simplicity, let us suppose that there are no matter fields on the horizon. Then, I_n, L_n are the moments of the Weyl tensor component Ψ_2 on Δ which is related to V by

$$dV = \Psi_2 \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where ϵ is the area 2-form defined by q . The definition of isolation implies that Ψ_2 is gauge invariant. To construct the moments, one needs a notion of spherical harmonics. It turns out that associated with every type II IH geometry (q, V) , there is a *canonical* type I geometry $(\mathring{q}, \mathring{V})$. One uses the spherical harmonics defined by the round metric $\mathring{q}$. To define $\mathring{q}$, let us first introduce a function ζ on S . Consider the orbits of the axial Killing field ϕ^a of q_{ab} on S and label its orbits by any fiducial coordinate z . Then, ζ is given by the partial areas:

$$\zeta(z) = -1 + 2 \frac{a(z)}{a}, \quad (2)$$

where a is the total area of S (with respect to q_{ab}) and $a(z)$ the partial area from the south pole up to the orbit of ϕ^a labelled by z . If φ is the angular coordinate along orbits of ϕ^a , the desired round metric $\mathring{q}$ is now given by:

$$\mathring{q}_{ab} = R^2 (\mathring{f}^{-1} D_a \zeta D_b \zeta + \mathring{f} D_a \varphi D_b \varphi), \quad (3)$$

where R is the area radius, $a = 4\pi R^2$, and $\mathring{f} = 1 - \zeta^2$. It can be put in the standard form by setting $\zeta = \cos \theta$. *It turns out that q and $\mathring{q}$ share the same area element.* Finally, the geometric multipoles are defined by:

$$I_n + iL_n = - \oint_S \Psi_2 Y_n^0(\zeta) d^2S \quad (4)$$

where S is any 2-sphere cross-section of Δ . (Since all geometries under consideration are axi-symmetric, we need only the Y_n^m with $m = 0$.) The I_n, L_n so defined are subject to mild algebraic restrictions. If (q, V) and $(\mathring{q}, \mathring{V})$ are related by a diffeomorphism, they have the same area and multipoles.

Next, let us consider the converse. Suppose we are given an area a and a set of numbers I_n, L_n (satisfying the mild algebraic conditions). Then one can construct, uniquely up to diffeomorphisms, a type II horizon geometry (q, V) , with horizon area a and geometric multipoles I_n, L_n . Start with a fiducial type I geometry $(\mathring{q}, \mathring{V})$, and set:

$$\Psi_2(\zeta) = \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (I_n + iL_n) Y_n^0(\zeta), \quad (5)$$

where ζ and the weighting functions $Y_n^0(\zeta)$ are defined by $\mathring{q}$. The desired physical metric q has the same form as (3) with $\mathring{f}(\zeta)$ replaced by $f(\zeta)$, constructed from the real part of Ψ_2 :

$$f(\zeta) := 4 \left[R_{\Delta}^2 \int_{-1}^{\zeta} d\zeta_1 \int_{-1}^{\zeta_1} d\zeta_2 \operatorname{Re} \Psi_2(\zeta_2) \right] + 2(\zeta + 1). \quad (6)$$

Finally, using full Ψ_2 of (5) and the fiducial type I connection $\mathring{V}$, one can construct the desired U(1) connection V :

$$V_a = \mathring{V}_a - \frac{1}{4}(f' - \mathring{f}')D_a\varphi + \frac{i}{2}\omega_a, \quad (7)$$

where the prime denotes derivative with respect to ζ and ω_a is the unique 1-form satisfying $d\omega = \text{Im}\Psi_2 \mathring{\epsilon}$ and $\mathring{q}^{ab}\mathring{D}_a\omega_b = 0$. All the information about multipoles is coded in $V - \mathring{V}$. Consequently, given a fixed area a and a set of multipoles I_n, L_n , the condition (1) satisfied by V is equivalent just to the equation

$$d\mathring{V} = -\frac{2\pi}{a} \epsilon \quad (8)$$

satisfied by any type I spin-connection $\mathring{V}$. This fact will be useful later. The horizon geometry (q, V) so constructed is of type II and has the desired area and multipoles. Furthermore, as one might expect, the fiducial $(\mathring{q}, \mathring{V})$ we began with is the canonical type I geometry associated with (q, V) . Finally, a detailed examination of this construction shows that to obtain (q, V) , full knowledge of the type I pair $(\mathring{q}, \mathring{V})$ is not necessary; all one needs is a foliation, $\mathring{V}$, horizon area a and the set of fixed multipoles I_n, L_n . Therefore, as we will see, the above constructions extend to quantum geometry.

Hamiltonian framework: Fix a 3-manifold M with an internal boundary S which has the topology of a 2-sphere. M is to be thought of as a (partial) Cauchy surface in $(\mathcal{M}, g_{ab})$, and the internal boundary S , as the intersection of M with an isolated horizon Δ in $\mathcal{M}$. The physical meaning of various fields is more transparent in the self-dual rather than real connection variables. Therefore, it is convenient to begin with pairs (A_a^i, Σ_{ab}^i) of forms with values in the complexification of the Lie algebra $\text{su}(2)$ on a 3-manifold M . A_a^i can be thought of as the pull-back to M of a self-dual Lorentz connection in space-time, and Σ_{ab}^i , the Hodge-dual of an orthonormal triad E_i^a of density weight 1 on M (apart from a factor of $16\pi i G$. For conventions, see [6].) $\epsilon_{ab} := (16\pi i G)\Sigma_{ab}^i r_i$ is the area 2-form on S induced by E_i^a , where the underbar denotes pull-back to S and r^i is the internal radial vector. $V_a := \frac{1}{2}\underline{A}_a^i r_i$ on S is the pull-back to S of the complex-valued U(1) connection of the horizon geometry. Thus, the real part of V_a is a U(1) connection on the spin-bundle over S while the imaginary part is a 1-form potential for the 2-form $\text{Im}\Psi_2 \epsilon$.

Our phase space Γ will consist of smooth pairs (A_a^i, Σ_{ab}^i) subject to certain boundary conditions. At infinity, the fields fall off suitably to be asymptotically flat (or, in the presence of a negative cosmological constant, asymptotically anti-de Sitter). For our purposes, the important boundary conditions are at S and they ensure that we are restricting ourselves to space-times with type II horizons having fixed area and multipoles. We require that: i) the induced geometry (q, V) on S is axi-symmetric with respect to *some* axial field ϕ^a ; ii) has a *fixed* area a_o ; and iii) the Ψ_2 defined through (1) leads to a *fixed* set of multipoles I_n^o, L_n^o via (4).² One can show that, on this restricted phase space, the symplectic structure of [3, 4]

² In the type I case, all physical multipoles except M_o are zero, M_o is simply $\sqrt{a_o/16\pi}$, and Ψ_2 of (1) is given by $-2\pi/a_o$. Therefore to single out the relevant sector of general relativity, it suffices to fix just the horizon area a_o . This is precisely what was done in [9] although at that time the notion of multipoles was not available.

reduces to:

$$\Omega(\delta_1, \delta_2) = - \int_M \text{Tr} (\delta_1 A \wedge \delta_2 \Sigma - \delta_2 A \wedge \delta_1 \Sigma) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{a_o}{4\pi G i} \oint_S \delta_1 \mathring{V} \wedge \delta_2 \mathring{V} , \quad (9)$$

where δ_1, δ_2 are any two tangent vectors to the phase space $\mathbf{\Gamma}$; Tr denotes the trace on internal $\text{su}(2)$ indices; and $\mathring{V}$ is the canonical type I spin connection associated with (q, V) via (7).

Finally, the functional calculus on the space of connections is well-developed only when the holonomies take values in compact Lie groups. With self-dual connections, in the Lorentzian domain this condition is not met. Therefore, as usual [6], we will make a canonical transformation to real $\text{SU}(2)$ connections, essentially by replacing the i in the relation between the canonical and geometrical variables with a real, positive parameter γ , called the Barbero-Immirzi parameter: $(A^i, \Sigma^i) \mapsto (\gamma A^i, \gamma \Sigma^i)$. In terms of these variables, the full symplectic structure is given by:

$$\Omega(\delta_1, \delta_2) = - \int_M \text{Tr} (\delta_1 \gamma A \wedge \delta_2 \gamma \Sigma - \delta_2 \gamma A \wedge \delta_1 \gamma \Sigma) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{a_o}{4\pi \gamma G} \oint_S \delta_1 \mathring{V} \wedge \delta_2 \mathring{V} . \quad (10)$$

Note that the surface term is the symplectic structure of a *Chern-Simons theory* for an $\text{U}(1)$ connection $\mathring{V}$, with level $k = a_o/4\pi\gamma\ell_{\text{Pl}}^2$. Because variations of only $\mathring{V}$ — rather than $\gamma V := \gamma \underline{A}^i r_i$ — appear, (8) provides the most convenient way to incorporate the key boundary condition that dV is given by (1), where Ψ_2 has the given set of multipoles.

Quantum horizon geometry: Each type II horizon geometry defines a canonical type I geometry. Furthermore, the Hamiltonian theory of the sector of general relativity admitting type II isolated horizons *with fixed area and multipoles* makes direct reference only to the type I connection $\mathring{V}$ and the restriction to fixed multipole sector is now coded in condition (8). Therefore, the problem of quantization reduces to that of type I theory and we can just take over all the mathematical constructions from [11]. However, the physical interpretation of states and operators has to be made in terms of the physical type II geometries now under consideration.

Let us first summarize the mathematical structure from [11]. To begin with, there is a kinematical Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$ where $\mathcal{H}_B$ is built from suitable functions of generalized connections in the bulk and $\mathcal{H}_S$ from suitable functions of generalized surface connections on S . The bulk Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_B$ describes the ‘polymer excitations’ of the bulk geometry. Each excitation which punctures S endows it with a certain quantum of area. The surface Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_S$ consists of states of the level k , $\text{U}(1)$ Chern-Simons theory for the connection $\mathring{V}$ on the punctured S . To ensure that S is indeed the desired horizon, only those states in $\mathcal{H}$ are selected which satisfy the operator analog of (8), called the quantum horizon boundary condition.³ This operator equation on permissible states allows the connection and the triad to fluctuate but demands that they do so in tandem. As emphasized in [11], this operator equation is stringent and admits a sufficient number of solutions only because of a surprising agreement between an infinite set of eigenvalues of a quantum geometry operator in the bulk agree with an infinite set of eigenvalues of

³ In addition, the states have quantum area and multipoles close to the macroscopic classical values. The multipole operators are defined below.

a Chern-Simons operator on S which in turn is possible precisely because of the isolated horizon boundary conditions. The subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ on which this condition is met is then the Hilbert space of kinematic states describing quantum geometry in the sector of general relativity now under consideration.

To describe the quantum horizon geometry, the first step is to use an operator analog of the partial area coordinate ζ which played a key role in the classical theory. Introduce a fiducial ‘foliation’ of S using *some* axial field ϕ^a and introduce a coordinate z to label the leaves. Motivated by (2), we are led to define an operator $\hat{\zeta}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$:

$$\hat{\zeta}(z) = -1 + 2 \frac{\hat{a}(z)}{\hat{a}_S}, \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{a}_S$ is the area operator associated with S and $\hat{a}(z)$ is the area operator associated with the open portion S_z of S bounded by the orbit of ϕ^a labelled by z (and containing, say, the ‘south pole’). To make the action of this operator explicit, let us first note [11] that the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$ can be decomposed as a direct sum,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}} = \oplus_{\mathcal{P}, \vec{j}} \mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{P}, \vec{j}}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes a finite set of punctures and $\vec{j}$ is a set of half integers labelling the punctures. In each state in $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{P}, \vec{j}}$ the I th puncture is endowed with a quantum of area of magnitude $8\pi\gamma\sqrt{j_I(j_I+1)}\ell_{\text{Pl}}^2$. Each of these subspaces is an eigenspace of the $\hat{\zeta}$ operator, with eigenvalue:

$$\zeta^{\mathcal{P}, \vec{j}}(z) = -1 + 2 \frac{\sum_{I'} \sqrt{j_{I'}(j_{I'}+1)}}{\sum_I \sqrt{j_I(j_I+1)}}, \quad (13)$$

where the sum in the numerator ranges over all punctures on S_z while the sum in the denominator ranges over all punctures on S . (The presence of $\hat{a}_S$ —rather than a_o —in the denominator ensures that eigenvalues of $\hat{\zeta}$ range from -1 to 1 as required in the definition of $Y_n^0(\hat{\zeta})$.) In the classical theory, the knowledge of ζ and multipoles I_n^o, L_n^o suffices to determine the horizon geometry (q, V) . The idea is to mimic that strategy. However, care is needed because the eigenvalues of $\hat{\zeta}$ are discontinuous functions: they jump at each z value where the orbit of ϕ^a contains a puncture. This makes the quantum geometry ‘rough’.

Fix a state in $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{P}, \vec{j}}$. To make the nature of the quantum geometry in this state explicit, let us introduce a set of smooth functions $\zeta_{(k)}(z)$ on S which converge to the eigenvalue $\zeta^{\mathcal{P}, \vec{j}}(z)$ in the sup norm as k tends to infinity. Then, each $\zeta_{(k)}$ defines via (3) a round metric $\hat{q}_{(k)}$. Using the fixed multipoles, for each k , we can define a smooth function $\Psi_2^{(k)}$:

$$\Psi_2^{(k)}(\zeta_{(k)}) = \frac{1}{R_o^2} \sum_{n=o}^{\infty} (I_n^o + iL_n^o) Y_n^0(\zeta_{(k)}). \quad (14)$$

Using $\text{Re}\Psi_2$ in (6), we obtain a sequence of functions $f^{(k)}, \mathring{f}^{(k)}$ through (6) and hence a sequence of axi-symmetric metrics $q_{(k)}$ and round metrics $\mathring{q}_{(k)}$ via (3). As k tends to infinity, $\Psi_2^{(k)}, f^{(k)}$ and $\mathring{f}^{(k)}$ have well-defined limits $\Psi_2, f, \mathring{f}$ which, however, are discontinuous functions on S . However, $q_{(k)}, \mathring{q}_{(k)}$ do *not* admit limits even in the distributional sense because the metric coefficients are quadratic in $d\zeta_{(k)}/dz$ and these functions tend to Dirac distributions in the limit. This is not surprising because polymer quantum geometry does not

naturally admit metric operators. Nonetheless, one can regard the family $q_{(k)}$ as providing an intuitive visualization of the quantum metric on the horizon in the following sense. First, a type II metric is completely determined by multipoles and the function ζ , and in the above construction multipoles are fixed and the $\zeta_{(k)}$ tend to the physical ζ uniformly. Second, every type II metric determines the multipoles I_n and for the family $q_{(k)}$ these are precisely the given I_n^o .

As one might expect from the type I analysis [11], the quantum connection operator can be defined more directly. Since $\hat{\hat{V}}$ is a well-defined quantum connection on $\mathcal{H}_S$, using (7) we can define an operator $\hat{V}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\text{kin}}$:

$$\hat{V} = \hat{\hat{V}} - \frac{1}{4}(f' - \mathring{f}')(\hat{\zeta}) D_a \varphi + \frac{i}{2} \omega_a(\hat{\zeta}), \quad (15)$$

where $f', \mathring{f}'$ and ω are all defined by the limiting procedure described above. $\hat{V}$ is a well-defined quantum connection: One can show that its holonomies along arbitrary (analytic) edges on S , including those which may have a puncture at their end points, are well-defined. $\hat{\hat{V}}$ is flat everywhere except at the punctures in the sense that the holonomy around a closed loop not enclosing any puncture is identity. This is not the case with $\hat{V}$. The distortion in the quantum horizon geometry manifests itself through these non-trivial holonomies. However, the ‘quantum Gauss Bonnet theorem’ [11] continues to hold: $\exp i \oint_S d\hat{V} = 1$.

Finally, we can define multipole operators. Taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ of (14) we obtain the Ψ_2 operator corresponding to the fiducial foliation of S :

$$\hat{\Psi}_2(z) = \frac{1}{R_o^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (I_n^o + i L_n^o) Y_n^0(\hat{\zeta}(z)). \quad (16)$$

(The numerical coefficient is left $1/R_o^2$ — rather than $4\pi/\hat{a}_S$ — to ensure the agreement with the definition of $\hat{\Psi}_2$ used in quantum horizon boundary condition of the type I analysis.) Quantum multipoles can be defined by replacing ζ in (4) by $\hat{\zeta}$. However some care involving a regularization in terms of $\zeta_{(k)}$ is needed to give precise meaning to the integral. One finds:

$$\hat{I}_n + i \hat{L}_n := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} - \oint_S \Psi_2^{(k)} Y_n^0(\zeta_{(k)}) d^2 S_{(k)} = \frac{\hat{a}_S}{a_o} (I_n^o + i L_n^o), \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{a}_S$ is the total area operator associated with S . Recall that in the analysis of type I horizons, the area was fixed classically but could have small quantum fluctuations in quantum theory. In the type II case the situation is similar with multipoles. Multipoles are the moments in the spherical harmonic decomposition with respect to $\hat{\zeta}$ and it is the quantum fluctuations in $\hat{\zeta}$ that induce quantum fluctuations in $\hat{I}_n, \hat{L}_n$. Since the former are dictated by fluctuations in $\hat{a}_S$ so are the latter. Finally, in this calculation the presence of $\hat{a}_S$ in the numerator is dictated by the definition (11) of $\hat{\zeta}$ while that of a_o in the denominator comes from the definition (16) of $\hat{\Psi}_2$.

Entropy: The calculation of entropy can be taken over from the type I analysis in a straightforward fashion. (Indeed, most of the above discussion of quantum operators encoding type II horizon quantum geometry is inessential to the counting argument.) We first impose quantum Einstein equations following the same procedure as in [11]. Denote the resulting Hilbert space by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phy}}$. To incorporate the fact that we are interested in the horizon states of a black hole with fixed parameters, let us construct a micro-canonical ensemble

consisting of states in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{phy}}$ for which the horizon area and multipoles lie in a small interval around a_o, I_n^o, L_n^o and count the Chern-Simons surface states in this ensemble. Since eigenstates of $\hat{a}_S$ are also eigenstates of $\hat{I}_n, \hat{L}_n$ and eigenvalues of $\hat{I}_n, \hat{L}_n$ are completely determined by I_n^o, L_n^o and a_S , the counting is the same as in the type I case [12, 13]. Hence the entropy S_{hor} is again given by

$$S_{\text{hor}} = \frac{a_{\text{hor}}}{4\ell_{\text{Pl}}^2} - \frac{1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{a_{\text{hor}}}{\ell_{\text{Pl}}^2}\right) + o \ln\left(\frac{a_{\text{hor}}}{\ell_{\text{Pl}}^2}\right) \quad (18)$$

provided γ is chosen as in the type I analysis [13].

We will conclude with a comment on inclusion of matter fields. If matter is minimally coupled to gravity, as in the type I case, there are no matter surface terms in the symplectic structure, whence there are no independent *surface* degrees of freedom associated with these matter fields. Furthermore, the gravitational symplectic structure continues to be given by (10) whence the analysis summarized here undergoes only inessential changes. In the non-minimally coupled case, the gravitational symplectic structure does change but, by introducing multipoles also for the matter fields, one can extend the analysis of [14] and show that the classically expected entropy expression [15] is recovered again for the same value of the Barbero-Immirzi parameter.

Proofs, details of constructions and a discussion of merits and limitations of this framework will appear elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

We thank Jacek Wiśniewski, Alex Perez and Daniel Sudarsky for stimulating discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation grants PHY-0090091, the Eberly research funds of Penn State and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation of Germany.

-
- [1] Ashtekar A and Krishnan B 2004 Isolated and Dynamical horizons and their properties, preprint [gr-qc/0407042](#)
 - [2] Bardeen J W, Carter B and Hawking S W 1973 The four laws of black hole mechanics *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31** 161-170
 - [3] Ashtekar A, Fairhurst S and Krishnan B 2000 Isolated Horizons: Hamiltonian Evolution and the First Law *Phys. Rev.* **D62** 104025.
 - [4] Ashtekar A, Beetle C and Lewandowski J 2001 Mechanics of rotating isolated horizons *Phys. Rev.* **D64** 044016
 - [5] Ashtekar A, Engle J, Pawłowski, T and Van Den Broeck C 2004 Multipole moments of isolated horizons *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** 2549-2570
 - [6] Ashtekar A and Lewandowski L 2004 Background independent quantum gravity: A status report, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** R53-R152
 - [7] Rovelli C 2004 *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)
 - [8] Thiemann T 2005 *Introduction to modern canonical quantum general relativity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge); draft available as [gr-qc/0110034](#)
 - [9] Ashtekar A, Baez J C, Corichi A, and Krasnov K 1998 Quantum geometry and black hole entropy (1998) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 904-907

- [10] Ashtekar A, Corichi A and Krasnov K 1999 Isolated horizons: the classical phase space *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **3** 418–471
- [11] Ashtekar A, Baez J C and Krasnov K 2000 Quantum geometry of isolated horizons and black hole entropy *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **4** 1–95
- [12] Domagala M and Lewandowski J 2004 Black hole entropy from Quantum Geometry *Preprint gr-qc/0407051*
- [13] Meissner K A 2004 Black hole entropy in loop quantum gravity *Preprint gr-qc/0407052*
- [14] Ashtekar A and Corichi A 2003 Non-minimal couplings, quantum geometry and black hole entropy 20 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20** 4473–4484
- [15] Ashtekar A, Corichi A and Sudarski D 2003 Non-Minimally Coupled Scalar Fields and Isolated Horizons *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20** 3413–3425